

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 3 are independent. Claims 1-4 have been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document. Acknowledgment thereof by the Examiner in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 15, 2003, and for providing Applicant with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

Drawings

Applicant has not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review PTO-948 or other indication of whether or not the formal drawings have been

approved by the Draftsperson. Since no objection has been received, Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,638. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, the Applicant submits that claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Further, it is possible that claims 1 and 3 may be further amended during the course of prosecution in this application. Applicant therefore elects to defer responding substantively to this rejection until a later time, if it becomes necessary. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,281,955B1 to Midorikawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a liquid crystal display device, including a color filter layer formed on the TFT, and in direct contact with the source and the drain, wherein said direct contact is only at a portion where said color filter layer is overlapping only edge portions of the source and drain.

Independent claim 3 has been similarly amended to recite a combination of steps in a method of manufacturing a liquid crystal display (LCD) device, including forming a color filter layer on the TFT, and in direct electrical contact with the source and the drain, wherein said direct electrical contact is only at a portion where said color filter layer is overlapping only edge portions of the source and drain.

Applicant respectfully submits that these combinations of elements and steps as recited in independent claims 1 and 3 respectively (as amended) are not disclosed or suggested by the applied art of record, including Midorikawa.

Midorikawa discloses a source 20 and a drain 18. Disposed upon an entire surface of source 20 and drain 18 are color filter layers 24a, 24b and 24c. These color filter layers literally blanket the source 20 and drain 18 of Midorikawa, thereby giving them complete coverage. In other words, the contacting portion of the color filter layers 24a, 24b and 24c with source 20 and drain 18 is not limited to edge portions of the source 20 and drain 18.

For the reasons explained above, Midorikawa fails to teach the above-recited features of independent claims 1 and 3. Claims 2 and 4 depend, either directly, or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 3, and therefore are patentable at least for the reasons stated with respect to independent claims 1 and 3. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant points out that all of the Examiner's comments have been addressed and that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been

*Application No. 10/757,521
Reply to Office Action dated November 15, 2004
Amendment filed February 15, 2005*

*Docket No. 3430-0200P
Art Unit: 2871
Page 8 of 8*

overcome, thereby placing all claims pending in the present Application in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Percy L. Square, Reg. No. 51,084 at (703) 205-8034 to discuss such matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 


Joseph A. Kolasch

Reg. No. 22,463

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000


JAK/PLS/ags
3430-0200P